

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 01054 01 OF 02 261710Z

51

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-03 INR-07 L-02 ACDA-05

NSAE-00 PA-01 PRS-01 SP-02 USIA-06 TRSE-00 SAJ-01

OC-05 CCO-00 EB-07 FCC-01 OIC-02 OMB-01 NASA-01 /058 W

----- 059486

R 261340Z FEB 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 327

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO OTP WASHDC

DCA WASHDC

MCEB WASHDC

JCS WASHDC

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

USLO SACLANT

CINCANT

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 1054

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: ETEL, MARR, NATO

SUBJ: NJCEC AGENDA ITEM - NICS FUNDING REQUIREMENTS AND NICS
CONFIGURATION

REFS: A. NICSMA-D/52; B. NICSMA-D/53; C. MESSAGE NAC 3364,
DTG 200940Z FEB 75; D. ADDENDUM TO NICSMA-D/53, DTD
FEB 20, 1975

SUMMARY: DOCUMENTS NICSMA-D/52 AND D/53 GENERATED CONSIDERABLE
INTEREST AT NATO HQ. INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE AND JOINT
COMMUNICATIONS-ELECTRONICS WORKING GROUP (JCEWG) HAVE DISCUSSED
THEM, AND NATO COMMUNICATIONS-ELECTRONICS BOARD (NCEB) HAS
SCHEDULED DISCUSSION. DISCUSSIONS TO DATE CENTERED ON NEED
OF SPECIFIC ALTERNATIVES FOR DECISION. NICSMA INITIALLY
RESISTED DEVELOPING ALTERNATIVES UNTIL MAJOR NATO COMMANDS
(MNCS) ESTABLISH FUNDING LEVEL FOR NICS IN 1976-80 COST-
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 01054 01 OF 02 261710Z

SHARING PERIOD. PRIMARILY BECAUSE OF JCEWG REQUEST, NICSMA
ISSUED AN ADDENDUM TO NICSMA-D/53. THE ADDENDUM PRESENTS TWO
VARIATIONS TO IMPLEMENTATION PLAN IN NICSMA-D/52, EACH COSTING
APPROXIMATELY IAU 15 MILLION LESS THAN THE ORIGINAL PLAN. THESE

ALTERNATIVES REVEAL BASIC ISSUES THE NATO JOINT COMMUNICATIONS-ELECTRONICS COMMITTEE (NJCEC) SHOULD ADDRESS AT ITS MARCH 1975 MEETING. THE MAJOR ISSUE IS WHETHER OR NOT TO INITIATE PROCUREMENT FOR THE NICS INTEGRATED NODAL NETWORK BEFORE 1980. TAKING THE AFFIRMATIVE, NICSMA FAVORS AN ALTERNATIVE INCLUDING PROCUREMENT OF TEN MIDAL SWITCHERS AND OTHER NODAL EQUIPMENT, REDUCING THE NUMBER OF TARES AND SECURE VOICE EQUIPMENTS, AND CURTAILING THE SCOPE OF THE ACE HIGH REPLACEMENT PROJECT. THE MNCS INCLINE TO AN ALTERNATIVE DELAYING NODAL EQUIPMENT AND BUYING ALL 19 OF THE PROGRAMMED TARES AND 300 ADDITIONAL SECURE VOICE EQUIPMENTS. BOTH ALTERNATIVES REDUCE THE NUMBER OF NEW SATELLITE GROUND TERMINALS TO THREE STATIC AND THREE TRANSPORTABLE.

IN THE ADDENDUM, NICSMA INVITES THE NJCEC TO GIVE POLICY GUIDANCE ON THE QUESTIONS RAISED BY THE TWO ALTERNATIVES. IT ALSO ASKS SPECIFIC DECISIONS ON THE NUMBERS OF SECURE VOICE EQUIPMENTS AND SATELLITE GROUND TERMINALS SO THAT PROCUREMENT ACTIONS CAN PROCEED.

MISSION RECOMMENDS STRONG US SUPPORT OF THE NICSMA-FAVORED ALTERNATIVE INCLUDING INITIAL PROCUREMENT OF NODAL EQUIPMENT BEFORE 1980. END SUMMARY.

1. THE TWO REFERENCED DOCUMENTS, NICSMA-D/52 AND D/53, BECAME "BEST SELLERS" AT NATO HQ. ALTHOUGH NICSMA PREPARED THEM FOR NJCEC ADDRESSAL, INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE AND JOINT COMMUNICATIONS-ELECTRONICS WORKING GROUP HAVE DISCUSSED THEM AND NATO COMMUNICATIONS-ELECTRONICS BOARD HAS SCHEDULED DISCUSSIONS OF THEM. ADDITIONALLY, MISSION REP (GENTRY) HAS DISCUSSED THEM WITH NICSMA DEPUTY DIRECTOR GENERAL (KISSINGER). THE MOST COMMON TOPIC IN ALL DISCUSSIONS WAS THAT THE OPTIONS NICSMA OFFERS IN NICSMA-D/53 ARE TOO NEBULOUS TO PERMIT SPECIFIC DISCUSSIONS.

2. IN INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE MEETING ON FEB 4, 1975, US REP (CAMPBELL) EXPRESSED DOUBT THA ANY GROUP COULD MAKE CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 01054 01 OF 02 261710Z

MEANINGFUL DECISIONS BASED ON THE OPTIONS NICSMA-D/53 PRESENTS. HE SUGGESTED THAT NICSMA SHOULD DEVELOP SPECIFIC PROPOSALS BASED ON ASSUMED LEVELS OF FUNDING FOR NICS. HE ALSO PROPOSED THAT THE INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE ASK THE MAJOR NATO COMMANDS (MNCS) TO PROVIDE NICSMA WITH ESTIMATES OF THE RANGE OF FUNDING THEY COULD SUPPORT FORNICS (RECOGNIZING THAT THE MNCS HAVE NOT FINALIZED THEIR 1976-80 INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAMS). THE COMMITTEE DECLINED TO MAKE THIS REQUEST OF THE MNCS, BUT THE MAJORITY OF THE MEMBERS AGREED THAT ADDITION OF SPECIFIC ALTERNATIVES WOULD IMPROVE NICSMA-D/53.

3. AT FEB 12, 1975 MEETING OF JOINT C-E WORKING GROUP (JCEWG), CHAIRMAN (VAN DER WILLIGEN) NOTED INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

ACTION AND STATED VIEW THAT NICSMA SHOULD NOT DEVELOP ALTERNATIVES UNTIL MNCS FINALLY DETERMINE THAT A FUNDING SHORTFALL EXISTS. NETHERLANDS REP (HOFMAN) POINTED OUT THAT MNCS WILL NOT PRESENT THEIR 1976-80 PROGRAMS UNTIL MAY OR JUNE, AND THAT IS TOO LATE TO BEGIN DEVELOPING ALTERNATIVES. HE CALLED FOR ACTION NOW. US REP (GENTRY) AGREED, EXPRESSING CONVICTION THAT BOTH NICSMA AND THE MNCS HAD AT LEAST PRELIMINARY INFORMATION SUITABLE FOR DEVELOPING ALTERNATIVES IN EVENT TOTAL REQUIRED FUNDING (IAU 154 MILLION) IS NOT AVAILABLE. SACLANT REP (WEKING) STATED THAT HIS COMMAND ALREADY HAD PREPARED A PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT. CANADIAN REP (MILNE) PROPOSED THAT NICSMA SHOULD ADDRESS THE PROBLEM FROM A COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM POINT OF VIEW; THAT IS, NICSMA SHOULD DEVELOP ALTERNATIVES WHICH MAINTAIN SYSTEM BALANCE WHILE MEETING TRAFFIC REQUIREMENTS AT LOWER COST. (FYI: OBJECTIVE OF CANADIAN PROPOSAL WAS TO OBTAIN A COMMUNICATIONS ENGINEERING SOLUTION NOT CONSTRAINED BY SO-CALLED REQUIREMENTS IMPOSED BY MNCS AND SOME ALLIES. END FYI) NATIONAL REPS DID NOT HAVE OFFICIAL GUIDANCE, BUT ALL PERSONALLY SUPPORTED THE CANADIAN PROPOSAL.

4. SENSING THE WILL OF THE NATIONAL REPRESENTATIVES, NICSMA REP (LEHARDY) INFORMED THE JCEWG THAT NICSMA ALREADY HAD BEGUN FORMULATING ALTERNATIVES. THE MNCS HAD BEEN PARTICIPATING TO SOME EXTENT. HE SKETCHED THE RESULTS AS OF THAT TIME, OFFERING THAT NICSMA WOULD REFINE THE ALTERNATIVES IN VIEW OF THE JCEWG DESIRES.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 NATO 01054 02 OF 02 261714Z

51

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-03 INR-07 L-02 ACDA-05

NSAE-00 PA-01 PRS-01 SP-02 USIA-06 TRSE-00 SAJ-01

OC-05 CCO-00 EB-07 FCC-01 OIC-02 OMB-01 NASA-01 /058 W

----- 059606

R 261340Z FEB 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 328

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO OTP WASHDC

DCA WASHDC

MCEB WASHDC

JCS WASHDC

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

USLOSACLANT

CINCLANT

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 1054

5. ON FEB 21 1975 NICSMA DISTRIBUTED ADVANCE COPIES OF AN ADDENDUM TO NICSMA-C/53. THE ADDENDUM PRESENTS TWO VARIATIONS FOR NICS IMPLEMENTATION IN THE 1976-80 COST-SHARING PERIOD. NICSMA AND THE MNCS HAVE AGREED ON SOME ELEMENTS COMMON TO BOTH VARIATIONS. HOWEVER, THEIR DIFFERENCES BRING FORTH SEVERAL FUNDAMENTAL ISSUES WHICH THE NJCEC SHOULD DECIDE IN MARCH 1975 TO PERMIT THE NICS PROGRAM TO PROCEED WITHOUT DELAY. THE FOLLOWING TABULATION SHOWS THE PRINCIPAL ITEMS CHANGED FROM ANNEX XI FOR EACH VARIATION (E.E., ITEMS NOT LISTED REMAIN AS STATED IN THAT ANNEX):

A. VARIATION A(FAVORED BY MNCS)

TARES: 18 PLUS 1 TRAINING, IAU 22.9M(MILLION)

SECURE VOICE: 550 EQUIPMENTS, IAU 13.1M

STATCOM: 3 STATIC SGT, IAU 6.1M

3 TRANSPORTABLE SGT, IAU 3.1M

SSMA/TDM PHASE III, NIL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 01054 02 OF 02 261714Z

ACE HIGH REPLACEMENT: IAU 17.0 M

ACE HIGH CONTROL SYSTEMS: IAU 1.7M

ANCILLARY FACILITIES: IAU 0.4M

NODAL NETWORK INTEGRATION: NIL

B. VARIATION B(FAVORED BY NICSMA)

TARES: 14 PLUS 1 TRAINING, IAU 18.3M

SECURE VOICE: 300 EQUIPMENTS, IAU 7.7M

STACOM: SAME AS VARIATION A

ACE HIGH REPLACEMENT: IAU 11.6M

ACE HIGH CONTROL SYSTEMS: IAU 1.6 M

ANCILLARY FACILITIES: IAU 0.3M

NODAL NETWORK INTEGRATION:

10 NODES, IAU 5.0M

7 MDCS, IAU 1.4M

50 MED SPED TERM, IAU 2.1M

OTHER COSTS, IAU 3.0M

C. THE TOTAL IMPLEMENTATION COSTS OF NICS FOR THE PERIOD 1971-1980 (PRESENT AND NEXT FIVE-YEAR COST-SHARING PERIODS) COMPARE AS FOLLOWS:

PRESENT IMPLEMENTATION PLAN: IAU 154.8M

VARIATION A: IAU 142.7M

VARIATION B: IAU 138.1M

6. THE TWO VARIATIONS MANIFEST A KEY ISSUE, WHETHER OR NOT TO INITIATE THE NICS NODAL NETWORK PRIOR TO 1980. NICSMA STRONGLY FAVORS PROCEEDING, WHILE THE MNCS (GIVEN INADEQUATE FUNDING FOR EVERYTHING) PREFER DELAY. NICSMA AGRUES THAT 14 OPERATIONAL TARES WILL MEET TRAFFIC REQUIREMENTS AND THAT THE ALLIES LIKELY WILL NOT APPROVE PROVUREMENT OF 300 ADDITIONAL SECURE VOICE EQUIPMENTS. (THE MNCS HAVE STATED THE LARGER

QUANTITIES AS "MINIMUM MILITARY REQUIREMENTS"). THEREFORE, NICSMA PROPOSES TO REDUCE THE NUMBERS OF TARES AND SECURE VOICE EQUIPMENTS TO OBTAIN FUNDS TO START IMPLEMENTING THE INTEGRATED NODAL NETWORK.

7. NICSMA DIFFERS WITH SHAPE ON THE ACE HIGH REPLACEMENT PROJECCT. SHAPE PROPOSES A " ONE-FOR-ONE" REPLACEMENT OF THE EXISTING SYSTEM. NICSMA CONTENTS THAT COMPLETE REPLACEMENT IS UNNECESSARY BECAUSE EXISTING OR PLANNED NATIONAL MILITARY TRANSMISSION SYSTEMS CAN SUPPLANT PORTIONS OF ACE HIGH. NICSMA
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 01054 02 OF 02 261714Z

CONSIDERS THIS APPROACH TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE GENERAL DESIRE OF NATIONS TO CONSOLIDATE COMMUNICATIONS WHERE FEASIBLE. IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT NICSMA AND THE MNCS AGREE ON REDUCING THE NUMBER OF NEW STAELLITE GROUND TERMINALS. THE THREE STATIC TERMINALS WILL BE TO ICELAND, ITALY, AND TURKEY. THE THIRD TRANSPORTABLE TERMINAL WILL SERVE SACLANT, WHO WILL DEPLOY IT IN EITHER PUERTO RICO OR THE AZORES.

8. THE KEY DECISION WHICH NICSMA ASKS THE NJCEC TO MAKE AT THE MARCH 1975 MEETING ARE AS FLOOWS(QUOTED FROM THE ADDENDUM TO NICSMA-D/52):

BEGIN QUOTE:

(A) TO DETERMINE THE ELEMENTS WITHIN THE NICS PROGRAM TO WHICH PRIORITY SHOULD BE ACCORDED, PARTICULARLY AS REGARDS EARLY VERSUS LATER INTEGRATION, AND IN THE LIGHT OF SUCH A DETERMINATION, TO GIVE DIRECTIONS ON THE WAY IN WHICH THE NICS IMPLEMENTATION PLAN SHOULD BE VARIED IN THE EVENT THAT THIS IS MADE NECESSARY BY FUND LIMITATIONS;

(B) AT LEAST TO DECIDE UPON THE SCOPE OF THE SATCOM III SATELLITE GROUND TERMINAL AND THE PILOT SECURE VOICE PROGRAMS IN ORDER THAT URGENT CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS, NOW PLANNED, CAN PROCEED.
END QUOTE

9. THE MISSION BELIEVES THAT PUBLICATION BY NICSMA OF THE ADDENDUM TO NICSMA-D/53 STRENGTHENS THE NICS PROGRAM AND HELPS ASSURE ITS FUTURE. SOME DEEP-SEATED ISSUES EMERGED, AND THE NATIONS NOW HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO EXPRESS THEIR VIEWS BEFORE THE MNCS COMPLETE THIR INFRASTRUCUTE PROGRAMS.

10. MISSION RECOMMENDS THAT THE US STRONGLY SUPPORT THE COURSE NICSMA PROPOSED IN VARIATION B. THIS COURSE INCORPORTATES SEVERAL US-SPONSORED NATO OBJECTIVES, AMONG THEM RAPID COMPLETION OF NICS AND CONSOLIDATION OF COMMUNICATIONS. IT ALSO RECOGNIZES THE US UNWILLINGNESS TO PROCURE LARGE QUANTITES OF ELCROVOX SECURE VOICE EQUIPMENT. MISSION BELIEVES THAT THE MNC-FAVORED ALTERNATIVE, IF ADOPTED, MAY DOOM NICSMA AND POSSIBLY

THE ULTIMATE NICS. THE NETHERLANDS REP TO JCEWG(HOFMAN)
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 NATO 01054 02 OF 02 261714Z

SATATED PRIVATELY THAT IF THE NJCEC DELAYS NODAL IMPLEMENTATION
UNTIL AFTER 1980, HIS GOVERNMENT VERY PROBABLY WOULD PRESS
FOR DISESTABLISHMENT OF NICSMA. THEY BLIEVE THAT NATO DOES
NOT NEED AN AGENCY LIKE NICSMA TO IMPLEMENT SEPARATE NETWORKS.
IN ADDITION, MISSION BELIEVES THAT SUPPORT OF NICSMA ON THIS
ISSUE WILL STREGTHEN NICSMA' POSITION IN DEALING WITH MNCS.
MANY OF NICSMA'S PROBLEMS COME FROM THE MNCS' PRACTIVE OF
STATING THEIR REQUIREMENTS IN TERMS OF TYPE AND QUANTITY OF
SPECIFIC EQUIPMENT, THEREBY FORECLOSING SOME SYSTEM DESIGN
OPTIONS. ACCEPTANCE BY THE NJCEC OF VARIATION B WOULD REAFFIRM
THE SYSTEM DESIGN FUNCTION ASSIGNED TO NICSMA.

11. MISSION SENT COPIES OF ADENDUM TO NICSMA-D/53 TO PENTAGON,
APO REGISTEDED BOX 2776, FEB 24, 1975 AND TO STATE SUB-
REGISTRY (UR-RPM), REGISTRY NO 750182, 25 FEB 75.

MCAULIFFE

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 26 FEB 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: CunninFX
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO01054
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19750286/abbrzild.tel
Line Count: 293
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 6
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A. NICSMA-D/52; B. NICSMA-\$/53; C. MESSAGE NAC 3364, DTG 200940Z FEB 75; D. ADDENDUM TO NICSMA-D/53, DTD FEB 20, 1975
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: CunninFX
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 25 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <25 APR 2003 by SmithRJ>; APPROVED <23 SEP 2003 by CunninFX>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
05 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: NJCEC AGENDA ITEM - NICS FUNDING REQUIREMENTS AND NICS CONFIGURATION
TAGS: ETEL, MARR, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO OTP
DCA
MCEB
JCS

USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR
SACLANT
CINCANT
Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006